

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50. Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918

VOL. XXIII, No. 6

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1929

WHOLE No. 617

MACMILLAN CLASSICAL SERIES

Recent Publications

New Elementary Latin, by ULLMAN and HENRY

A new first year book for use where a two-semester course without the subjunctive is desired

STRIKING features of this new book abundant new and interesting illustrations. It meets the recommendations are: correlation of Latin and English; abundant material on Roman civilization; connected reading with every lesson; great variety of drill exercises; correlation with French and Spanish; introduction of vocative and imperative; large type;

Titles Now Included

- ELEMENTARY LATIN,
Ullman and Henry, \$1.40
- NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN,
Ullman and Henry, \$1.40
- SECOND LATIN BOOK, *Revised*,
Ullman and Henry, \$1.68
- SECOND LATIN BOOK, *To be Replaced by the Revised Edition*,
Ullman and Henry, \$1.68
- THIRD LATIN BOOK,
Ullman, Henry, and White, *In Preparation*
- PROGRESS TESTS IN LATIN,
Ullman and Smalley, \$.80
- EASY LATIN PLAYS,
Lawler, \$.30

Second Latin Book, Revised

by ULLMAN and HENRY

THIS book follows closely on the steps of the New Elementary Latin. Treatment of the subjunctive has been greatly amplified to give the grounding omitted in the first-year course. All the lessons are based upon a carefully graded Latin text. Adapted selections from Livy, Eutropius, Caesar's Gallic War, and many other Latin works are included. In attractive format, plentiful illustrations, and modern treatment this book matches the other Ullman and Henry textbooks.

Easy Latin Plays

By LILLIAN B. LAWLER

TWENTY plays which meet the need known to every teacher of the first two years of Latin for plays of "made Latin" not submerged in technical difficulties. The subject matter deals with Rome. The vocabulary is simple, and the constructions adapted to sight reading. Ample directions for staging and costuming, as well as numerous illustrations showing scenes as given by the author's pupils, make it easy to produce the plays as well as to read them.

New York
Boston
Chicago

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Atlanta
Dallas
San Francisco

A New Book for Beginners

PLACE'S FIRST YEAR LATIN

By PERLEY O. PLACE, Litt.D.,
Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

403 pages. Richly illustrated. \$1.32

THE reviewers, special critics, and teachers who have examined this new book say that it possesses the following qualities. We, as the publishers of the book, agree with them.

Sufficiently Comprehensive
Definitely Practical
Absolutely Thorough
Remarkably Simple
Surprisingly "Alive"
Refreshingly Interesting
Delightfully Cultural

Place's First Year Latin follows the Recommendations of the Report of the Classical Investigation, postponing until the second year the more difficult forms and constructions. *Place's Intermediate Latin Lessons* contains the forms and principles which the Report recommends should be studied in the beginning of the second year. It provides work for six weeks. Its price is forty cents. The *Enlarged Edition of Place's First Year Latin* includes the *Intermediate Latin Lessons*, price, \$1.40.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIII, No. 6

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1929

WHOLE NO. 617

A COMPARISON OF THE TREATMENT BY VERGIL AND BY OVID OF THE AENEAS-DIDO MYTH

A traditional myth is the property of whoever cares to use it, a trite observation best exemplified in classical literature by the varied treatment given to a single theme by different Greek tragic writers. Like the cloud in *The Clouds* of Aristophanes or in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, a myth is an ever-varying, ever-shifting entity. A comparison of the treatment of the Aeneas-Dido myth by Vergil and the version of the myth presented by Ovid will reveal many points both of contrast and of similarity, not merely in detail and technique, but in general scope and spirit.

Augustus's treatment of the two poets serves to differentiate them at the outset, for, whereas Vergil died at Brundisium in the company of Augustus, who cherished him to the end, Ovid died in exile, after a decade at Tomis, far from his beloved Roman society.

In Augustus's time Roman society showed a marked cleavage between the conservative party, led by the Empress Livia, supported vigorously by her now model husband, and the liberals, as represented by the two Julias, daughter and grand-daughter of the Emperor by a former wife, and Tiberius, subsequently Emperor, the son of Livia, and ultimately husband of Julia the Elder. Vergil's whole life, temperament, spirit, and poetry supported, and was in turn supported by, the conservative party. The liberals looked on Ovid as their darling; he catered to their license and degeneracy. Again, we find that all the works of Ovid that preceded his banishment, including even parts of the *Fasti*, are permeated consistently with the elements of the lustful, the lecherous, and the libidinous. In the *Vita Vergili* ascribed to Donatus (9-10), there is a discussion of the disproof of Vergil's sexual immorality in both senses of the word; but we do not need the tradition that the soubriquet 'Maiden-faced' was applied to Vergil to be convinced of his purity of life and thought. His three accepted major works confirm it absolutely. Finally, Vergil never married, Ovid was married thrice. It is interesting to note here that in *Heroides* 4 Ovid is comparatively free from licentiousness, whereas Vergil is wholly free from it always, descending to his lowest in suggestivity in *Eclogue* 3.8-9, if we may rule out *Catalepton* 13 as spurious.

The references made above to the larger moral, social, and spiritual aspects of the two authors and their times are by no means impertinent; the topic under discussion is a love theme.

The particular sections of poetry to be compared here are the following. For Ovid we have a single complete *étude* in epistolary form, *Heroides* 7, consisting of 196 lines. The *Heroides* are probably the earliest works of Ovid that have been preserved. They

were all written when Ovid was between 24 and 28 years of age, after the death of Vergil and after the publication, by Varius and Tucca, of the *Aeneid*. For Vergil we have a section of 705 lines, namely *Aeneid* 4, written probably in the last twelve years of his life, when he was between the ages of 39 and 51. Its official appearance was posthumous and against the author's will, though he considered Books 2, 4, and 6 the best sections of the *Aeneid*, and read them himself to the Emperor. The Aeneas-Dido episode is mostly confined to Book 4, as an element in the development of the hero's spirit; nevertheless, it dominates the subjective aspect of all the earlier books, and echoes of it are heard even after Book 6.

The verse-form employed by Vergil as his vehicle of expression was the dactylic hexameter, the oldest form of European literature. The elegiac distich, or classical heroic-couplet, was Ovid's choice, a form varying but slightly from the hexameter, and nearly as old as Hesiod. In selecting his meter each poet chose wisely. The dactylic hexameter is the best meter for a national epic. Ovid's elegiacs are supreme in Latin literature for fluency, dexterity, variety, and speed. Every even line in this poem is terminated by at least a semicolon; after most even lines comes a colon or a period. This is correct. The epistolary form is a novelty in Roman letters, coming in, by way of the *Arethusa* poem of Propertius (4.3), from the ingenious Alexandrians rather than from the original Greek genius of the fifth and the fourth centuries B. C.

In general, where Vergil is dignified, Ovid is sensuous; Vergil is moral and profound, Ovid shallow and excitant; in Vergil passionate sincerity, in Ovid merely querulous artificiality is noticeable. In fine, Ovid's poem is pitched in a key much less intense and more ignoble than is Vergil's. Vergil makes the reader feel that he is following the destiny of two Empires in conflict, namely the Roman-Trojan and the Carthaginian, and not merely the ephemeral and subjective feelings of two individuals. We have the abrupt tableau of Ovid contrasted with the developed drama of Vergil.

There is a very close resemblance between the main facts of the Aeneas-Dido story as the story is told by Vergil and as it is told later by Ovid. In the following details the poets may be said to correspond perfectly (other details wherein they differ will subsequently be brought out).

Elissa, alias Dido, together with her sister Anna and a small company of faithful followers, left Tyre, in the littoral of Phoenicia, because Dido's husband Sychaeus had been foully murdered for gold and power by her brother Pygmalion. In fear of her life Dido fled to another land, Africa, and there as a foreign woman founded a city and repelled her suitors, the native chieftains, such as Gaetulian Iarbas.

From the sack of burning Troy Aeneas had escaped, carrying the Penates and bearing his aged father Anchises on his shoulders, and accompanied by his son Ascanius and his wife Creusa (she was lost, however, as Aeneas was leaving Troy). After seven years of wandering, mostly at sea, during which time Anchises died, Aeneas and his company are shipwrecked on Dido's coasts.

Dido gives Aeneas her kingdom, after their passion had been consummated in the grotto during the rain storm. Rumors of her concubinage are circulated, and about this time Mercury, at the bidding of Jupiter, directs Aeneas to move on to Italy and Latium.

It is at this juncture that Dido may be said to have written the letter which Ovid ascribes to her. In the appeal of Dido to Aeneas, as portrayed in Ovid's letter, we have the story collected from both sides, objectively and subjectively recorded, and fused compactly, somewhat as follows. Dido's passion is described by similes, as of torches (23-24). Always Aeneas besieges her mind awake and asleep (25-26). Her chief regret is that she had loved too well if not wisely (29-30). Soon must she go (98), reluctant and full of contrition, to Sychaeus, to whom she belongs (103), and whose shrine and memory she has long cherished (99). She curses the story of the god's behest (141), ironically scorning, with feminine limitations and strength, Aeneas's devotion to his father and his fatherland (81)—a devotion which Cicero (*De Inventione* 2.65) defines for us as *pietas*—and inveighs against him because he loves Iulus more than he loves her (75).

Forthwith she proffers excuses and voices alternative plans. Let Troy and Tyre be amalgamated at Carthage (151); would Italy and Latium welcome Aeneas, an hostile foreigner (15)? Could he build a city like unto Carthage (19)? Would he not again betray some native princess (17)? Let him wait till spring (41), till she can learn to bear her sorrows. His comrades need rest (175), his fleet needs to be overhauled (176). She hints at possible maternity on her own part, and suggests his double murder of herself and unborn babe (133). This child, as usual in Latin literature, is assumed to be a boy. Dido's own acceptance of this preference ought to have schooled her to submission, as an inferior, to her own fate. Catullus portrays this theme of a baby, as yet unborn, that shall delight the home of his parents (61.211). Nor has his description ever been excelled. Vergil's fourth Eclogue is too dignified to be charming. He catches the proper spirit much better in Aeneid 4 (327). Ovid here is just ordinary and vulgarly realistic. He fails utterly to excite sympathy.

Finally, Dido threatens to use Aeneas's sword to slay herself; her darkling hints leave little doubt concerning the *dénouement*. In Ovid she threatens, and writes her threat to Aeneas. In Vergil she plots all alone and imparts her true purpose to no one.

This, in the main, comprises the factual information conveyed by each poet. Perhaps it would be better to state that the briefer poet, Ovid, *here* coincides with Vergil, his more ample prototype. It remains to

investigate the distinctions between the two poets both in details and in general treatment.

It would be a difficult task to sift from Ovid any fact, other than a most minor detail, not found also in Vergil. The treatment of details varies, but Ovid is, for all general purposes, completely comprehended in Vergil. The latter, however, has much that Ovid omits. In Aeneid 4 one finds long conversations between Anna and Dido (9-53, 416-436), heavenly interposition, by Juno (115-127) and by Venus (105-114), that most glorious and colorful story of the hunt (129-172), Iarbas's prayer to his father (206-218), the two appearances of Mercury (238-278, 553-570), the former of which is so graphic, Aeneas's perplexity and travail (393-396) and the finale (630-692). The form of Dido's letter precludes the possibility of the inclusion of certain things, yet Ovid has lost much in having to omit Dido's plot, debate, international curse, and the incidents of Barce and Iris, the former a truly pathetic touch of domestic fidelity enhancing the tragic pathos, the latter another case of the *deus ex machina*.

The stylistic distinctions it is impossible to let pass without comment, for the style often reflects the soul and spirit of a poet. Each poet runs true to form in the portions of his work selected here for study.

Where in Ovid's poem can be found Homeric similes such as those involving the arrow-stricken deer (Aeneid 4.68-73), the swarming ants (Aeneid 4.401-408), the Alpine blasts on the mountain oaks (Aeneid 4.438-449), and the frantic Pentheus and Orestes (Aeneid 4.465-473)?

Ovid nowhere gives us any such passage as that beginning with *Nox erat* (Aeneid 4.522-528), and followed by *At non infelix*, etc. (529-553). Each passage is excellent; the dramatic contrast between the calm placidity of the former and the anguish of the latter is not in Ovid's power. Again, Aurora leaving the saffron couch of Tithonus (Aeneid 4.584-585) is more charming than the Homeric original (*Iliad* 11.1-2). Finally, since Death should, in poetry, always be beautified, what more beauteous lines could be written than those which describe the descent of Iris in all her trailing glory (4.693-702)?

In Aeneid 4 Vergil strikes many a different note in the gamut, such as the sententious *Degeneres animos timor arguit* (13), and the cynical *Quid vota furentem, quid delubra iuvant?* (65-66), which is somewhat akin to the human note of *quis fallere possit amantem?* (296). Pathos might be represented by *si bene quid de te merui fuit aut tibi quicquam dulce meum* (317-318), and desperation by *Nusquam tula fides* (373). In *Tantos illa suo rumpebat pectore questus* (553) we have true poignancy; we have arrogance, even for a god, in *Varium et mutabile semper femina* (569-570). Perhaps the most innately Vergilian passage is *Improbe Amor, quid non mortalia pectora cogis?* (412), a verse blood-brother in pity to that which describes the hands of the unburied dead stretched out in yearning for the further shore (6.314).

It seems highly useful to record the technicalities of *poiesis* employed by Ovid in his letter. Their very

multitude is highly significant of the shallowness of thought implied and here actually found to be existing.

If we begin with the two lines which in some editions form a preface to *Heroides* 7, we note that Ovid repeats the word *legis* for a definite effect (2); in verse 6 we have *perdiderim*, *perdere* side by side. Verse 6 contains also a chiasmus. Verses 7 and 9, of similar meter, each begin with *certus es*. In 8 both *vela* and *fidem* are objects of *ferent*; in 9 *solvere* is used both in the figurative and in the literal sense. In 13 we find *Facta* and *facienda*, in 13 and 14 *quaerenda* and *quaesita*, in 14 *altera* introducing each half of the line. In 23 and 24 *ut* is repeated; in 25 and 26 *Aeneas* and *Aenean* are the first words, and there is a verb at the end of each verse; in 30 *queror* is picked up in *questa*. In 31 the juxtaposition *Venus, nurui* is hardly any more accidental than is that of *fratrem, Frater* in 31-32. In 35 we find Ovid ringing the changes on *Fallor* and *falso*. In 41 *hiems* and *hiemis* are contiguous bricks separated only by the mortar of punctuation and sense, whereas verse 43 is, in spirit at least, entirely artificial, and, at this juncture, unnatural. Verses 47 and 48 contain three borrowings from financial phraseology. The personification in 55 might, in any other author, be glossed over. Here it seems to be one more item in the cumulative evidence. In 59 a reference to love terminates each of the main divisions. Verse 61, *Perdita ne perdam timeo, noceamve nocenti*, is a perfect chiasmus balanced on *timeo*; it has, also, a tricky repetition in each section. The pun in 62 of *aequoreas* and *aquas* is surely not accidental, nor is the reference to 'Phrygian fraud' in 68. The beauty of *sanguinolenta* in 70 should not pass unmentioned, since such beauty is comparatively rare in this letter. The expression in 71, *Quicquid id est*, may be a commonplace of diction, yet, where Ovid is so obviously imitating Vergil, one is reminded perforce of 'the gift-bearing Greeks'. The jingle *pelagique tuaeque* in 73, the contrast of *breve* and *grande* in 73 and 74, the repetition of *parcas* by *parcatur* in 75, *quid* in 77 beginning each phrase, and the conceit of *ignibus* and *unda* in 78 constitute a rather dense congeries of varied artificialities. The slight force of *neque* in 79 is contrasted with the heavier force of *nec quae* later in the same verse. In 83 Ovid uses a beautiful adjective, *formosi*; in 84 *occidit* at the beginning of the line is followed by a practically full stop in sense and punctuation. The word *caeruleus* in 94 is colorful; *ululasse* in 95 is onomatopoeic; 98 contains alliterations involving the letter *m* and the letter *p*; in 103 Ovid repeats a trick of collocation in *venio; venio*. One feels an etymological identity in *errandum* and *error* in 109. In 117 *fratrique elapsa fretoque* is extraordinarily clever. In 118 there is the antithesis in the meanings of *donavi* and *emo*, in 121 the recurrence of *Bella* and *bellis*; 124 contains seven sibilants; in 128 *respergi* is set over against *sparsa*. In 130 *caelestes impia* is another case of collocation, a trick so difficult in English versification; in *elapsis* and *elapsos* of 131 and 132 we have an old offender; the thought of 137 shows more ingenuity than genius. In 139, *Sed iubet ire deus! Vellem vetuisset adire*, there is a

subtle similarity in *-et ire* and *adire* when the verse is read aloud; in 143 and 148 the letter *t* predominates. The word *hic* begins each clause of 156; in 170 we find repeated the sound *-antque*; 177 and 178 each begin with *pro*; each half of 179 begins with *dum*. Surely a desolate woman on the point of suicide would not continue to use such artificial rhetoric! Yet in 183-184 we find *scribentis* and *scribimus*, and in 185-186 *lacrimae* and *lacrimis*. The parallel of love and steel in 189 and 190 is quaint; the repetition of *Anna soror, soror Anna* of 191 is false, as is the parallel of *causam* and *ensem* in 195. We find Ovid true to form to the end in setting *ipsa* and *sua* side by side in 196.

When clever turns of expression may be found on an average of once in every three lines, the fact is highly significant. It is doubtful if *Aeneid* 4, containing more than three and a half times as many verses, shows the same actual number of clever rhetorical artificialities. Certainly the percentages would be in the nature of a contrast rather than of a similarity.

We have now treated various aspects of the study by Vergil and Ovid of the Aeneas-Dido myth. So far the discussion has been primarily concerned with what Aristotle might have called the accidentals; the essentials remain for brief consideration. The term 'essential' is used here to cover the psychological 'motivation', and the inner spiritual significance of the acts of the principals.

If we had only Ovid as our source, we should have only about half the story, and that refracted through the prejudiced medium of a person vitally interested, Dido. Vergil professes to analyze Aeneas's side of the story, but he in turn is prejudiced toward the masculine and the imperial. Again, Ovid's story is told rather incoherently—certainly not in chronological order—as contrasted with the consequential though impetuous development of the lovers' passions as narrated by Vergil. Furthermore, despite the larger percentage of proper nouns in Vergil, a phenomenon that suggests the Alexandrians, both Aeneas and Dido are human beings, passionate, acting with the early Greek *naïveté* of comparative unconsciousness. Ovid seems more theoretical, and his heroine is more self-conscious and rationalistic, a trait exemplified, *inter alia*, by her expression *idoneus auctor* (105), used in self-defense toward Sychaeus.

Ovid's heroine does *not* hate her lover or wish his death and destruction, whereas, in Vergil, Dido's truest love turns to bitterest hate, and she prays not only that Aeneas himself shall be shipwrecked, but also that the curse of enmity between her people and his shall endure through the generations to come. This difference is due somewhat to the fact that Ovid is writing rather from Dido's point of view, Vergil from Aeneas's.

The most interesting aspect of this entire episode in Vergil is the analysis of the mutual responsibility of the hero and the heroine for their transgression of the formal social code. The vulgar, sentimental opinion, based on chivalry, arouses a pathetic sympathy for Dido and stamps Aeneas as an irresponsible light-o'-love. Vergil works up the plot with consummate

artistry to the dissipation of the cloud and the first meeting of Dido and Aeneas (1.586-592). Dido, not ignorant of suffering, knows well how to sympathize with Aeneas's sufferings (1.630), and pity is akin to love, as is admiration for dangers experienced, a fact which Shakespeare brings out in his portrayal of Desdemona. Aeneas nowhere leads the wooing, nowhere pledges himself. Creusa was lost by fate, precisely as Dido must be, to allow the hero to march unrestricted toward his imperial destiny. Anchises, who might have controlled the situation, died just before the Dido episode began; his influence reappears immediately after the consummation of the love of Aeneas and Dido, and in Book 5 most particularly. Iulus is used as a means to further rather than to retard the passion of Dido and Aeneas. Finally, Aeneas suffers a fearful agony of distraction as to where his duty lies—*duty*, that Stoic word so significant in all Empires! By a strange fatalism over which neither Dido nor Aeneas had the slightest control, they were brought together. For their mutual acts they were mutually and equally responsible; each suffered for them after his kind. It seems, perhaps, as if Aeneas should be condemned for having surrendered, even in circumstances most propitious for such a surrender, to mere love of woman since, as a child of destiny, he must always move forward toward his fated goal. That he should be condemned for leaving an individual to fate in order to fulfill through toil and sorrow his heaven-sent mission in behalf of his people seems both false and sentimental. Surely not wholly inapplicable here are Kingsley's words, "men must work, and women must weep", or Vergil's *Sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt*, or Shakespeare's, in Othello, "The Pity of it".

BOWDOIN COLLEGE

THOMAS MEANS

REVIEWS

A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age: From Tiberius to Hadrian. By J. Wight Duff. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1927). Pp. xiv + 674.

Sixteen years have elapsed since Dr. E. S. McCartney, in reviewing Professor J. W. Duff's work, A Literary History of Rome From the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7.164-168), wrote as follows (164, 168):

Notwithstanding the imposing array of literary histories... we are glad to welcome the new arrival... Those that follow him <Duff> into this field of study *non passibus aequis* will find entertainment and instruction in his train, while the scholar, too, may profit by his companionship.... The work is, indeed, a *μεγά βιβλίον* but *μέλα κακόν* is not a corollary of the statement....

I may remark at the outset that Professor McCartney's statements are fully applicable also to the volume now under review, A Literary History in the Silver Age: From Tiberius to Hadrian, inasmuch as it is based on the same principles, with stress laid "...on the national character imprinted upon Latin literature

despite all borrowings from Greek models..." (Preface, ix).

It is worth while to mention here that, in the field of Latin literature in the Silver Age, Professor Duff had a predecessor, namely Professor W. C. Summers, the well-known editor of Seneca's Letters (Macmillan, 1910). Mr. Summers's excellent book, The Silver Age of Latin Literature (Methuen and Co., London, 1920), is, I believe, to be found on the shelves of every student interested in Latin literature¹. A comparison of the two books will immediately disclose marked differences in the treatment of the subject. Mr. Summers adheres to a system of pigeonholing and discusses under separate headings the different branches of literature, e.g. the epic, oratory, philosophy, correspondence, etc. Thus Seneca, for example, is treated in the chapters on Light and Miscellaneous Verse (the epigram), Philosophy, Correspondence, Drama, etc. Professor Duff's treatment is different. Since he regards both the historical background and the literary evolution as of vital importance (Preface, x), his treatment is in the main chronological. There is another point. While Mr. Summers omits entirely Suetonius and Florus, they are included in Professor Duff's book. Furthermore, in his Epilogue (650-658), Professor Duff adds a short sketch of the literature subsequent to the Silver Age, from Fronto to Rutilius Namatianus.

Professor Duff does not immediately plunge in *medias res*. The Introduction, consisting of two fascinating chapters, the Prologue (1-22), and Roman Education under the Empire (23-41), acquaints the reader with the changed literary conditions and peculiarities of the age under discussion, and aims to show (21) that "...the Silver Age does by a natural process of literary evolution continue tendencies already present in Augustan times". This method of approach shows good judgment. Thus a great variety of topics is reviewed, e.g. the relation of the Emperors to literature, the historical aspects of the period from Tiberius to Hadrian, the influence of Stoic philosophy, the influence of rhetoric, the reasons for the variety in Silver Latin literature, etc.

No factor exercised so dominating an influence upon the literary characteristics of the Silver Age as education. In the Prologue, Professor Duff hints (8-9) that education in letters and in rhetoric was one of the formative factors that made Silver Latin literature a complex. In Chapter II he discusses the subject more fully, and reviews the evolution of Roman education with special emphasis on our period. The *declamatio*, the *controversia*, and the *suasoria* are duly stressed. Attention is paid also to the growing interest of the Emperors in the problems of higher education and to subsidies made by the Emperors to education.

Having thus laid the foundation for the study of Silver Latin literature, the author proceeds to the subject proper, which embraces the years 14-138 A.D. These years Professor Duff divides into five periods, as follows:

¹The poetry of the Silver Age has been also treated by H. E. Butler, Post-Augustan Poetry from Seneca to Juvenal (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1909). <For a review of Professor Summers's book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.151-152. C. K.>.

I. Literature under Tiberius, Caligula and Claudius, 14-54 A.D. (42-159); II. Literature of the Neronian Period, 54-68 A.D. (160-346); III. Literature of the Flavian Period, 69-96 A.D. (347-530); IV. Literature under Nerva and Trajan, 96-117 A.D. (531-627); V. Literature in the Reign of Hadrian, 117-138 A.D. (628-649).

In dealing with the individual authors Professor Duff adheres more or less faithfully to a set scheme. First he discusses a writer's life and environment, for it is his avowed purpose "...to recreate the environment amidst which <each author> wrote" (Preface, ix). This discussion is followed by an enumeration of the author's works, their sources, their chronology, and generous summaries of the more important works. Then comes, usually, a discussion of the author's borrowings, of his originality, his merits and his weak points. Finally, there are added an account of special features of the author's language and the qualities of his style, and, in the case of a poet, a treatment of his versification. This attention to the stylistic peculiarities of prose writers and poets constitutes, in my opinion, one of the finest features of the book. Another feature is that Professor Duff finds space also to trace the influence exerted by individual writers on other literatures, the English in particular. While major authors receive plenty of space, minor writers are as a rule relegated to the end of each chapter and receive only the honor of mention.

The first period lacks great representative writers. It produced only one poet worthy of notice, Phaedrus (133-154), whose fables after all possess historical value rather than poetic merit. The other writers of this period are either rhetoricians (Seneca the Elder and Valerius Maximus), or second-rate historians (Velleius Paterculus and Curtius Rufus), or representatives of science (Celsus and Mela). Very appreciative is the treatment of Seneca the Elder (42-64) and that of Valerius Maximus (65-81). The latter finds in Professor Duff a powerful defender. E. Norden wrote thus of Valerius (*Die Antike Kunstprosa*, I.303 [Leipzig, Teubner, 1915]):

Valerius Maximus eröffnet die lange Reihe der durch ihre Unnatur bis zur Verzweiflung unerträglichen Schriftsteller in lateinischer Sprache.

One cannot think of a more condemnatory verdict. Professor Duff, on the other hand, attempts to rehabilitate Valerius, quite successfully, in my opinion, and finds in his work many a feature that may atone for his rhetorical quality (76). He says (81):

So, while he is not a thinker even to the limited extent that Paterculus is, while he is casual in investigation, superficial in comment, and too often showy in style, yet, as a literary landmark, he possesses historical importance sufficient to justify an attentive examination of his work.

To find some qualities in a writer of Velleius's type and to state them in a cogent manner clearly shows Professor Duff's gift of interpretation.

The literature of the Neronian Age shows marked variety and individuality both in poetry and in prose. We have here Columella (160-168), who, by composing in hexameters¹ the tenth book of his didactic treatise on agriculture, fulfilled Vergil's wish, expressed in his

Georgics (4.144), that others after him should treat horticulture, a subject which Vergil failed to include (...*aliis post me memoranda relinquo*). Professor Duff brings out well the combination of poet and novelist in Petronius (169-195), with due stress on his artistic realism (186-188). Seneca the Younger is treated partly as philosopher (196-236), partly as satirist and poet (237-278). In handling all the problems pertaining both to Seneca's complex personal character and to the manifold character of his works, Professor Duff displays a deft hand and an unprejudiced mind.

A discussion of Persius (279-295), Lucan (296-329), and Calpurnius Siculus closes the treatment of the Neronian Age. While Professor Duff realizes that "Immediate delight is not obtainable from Persius" (291), he nevertheless has some kind words for him and tries to find interesting qualities in him. Yet, in my opinion—*sit venia verbis*—, the whole account bears the character of a *suasoria*.

Professor Duff believes (322) that Meliboeus, mentioned in Calpurnius Siculus 4.158-159, is Seneca, and not, as Haupt thinks, Calpurnius Piso. I agree rather with Professor Summers (91), who considers either identification as caprice. I may add that the Panegyric on Piso and the Einsiedeln Eclogues are also included in this chapter, as well as a discussion of the Aetna and the Ilias Latina. I am disappointed, however, that the excellent (second) edition of Calpurnius (including the Einsiedeln Eclogues), by Caesar Giarratino (*Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum*, No. 44, Turin, 1924)¹, is not included in the Bibliography.

We pass now to the account of the Flavian Period. Here Pliny the Elder is first discussed (347-385). I mentioned above that Professor Duff attempted to rehabilitate Valerius Maximus. He quite successfully defends Pliny against the attacks of some modern "Quellenforscher" (357-359). I quote his characterization of Pliny's work (364-365, 367):

Among questions affecting this elaborately stratified fabric of ancient knowledge, the temptation may arise to inquire what is its scientific worth to-day. Certain drawbacks lie on the surface. One sees that the author was too bookish to be original, too receptive to be experimental, too acquisitive to be discriminating.... We hear in him no Baconian trumpet-call towards research as a condition of intellectual advance; but, then, can experiment be demanded at a stage when, in spite of mechanical discoveries... scientific instruments and appliances were as yet imperfectly developed? It is, in truth, easy, though not over-helpful toward a just estimate, to criticize Pliny for all his weakness in science when compared with standards of the present....

No number of shortcomings, however, can rob this encyclopaedia of its historical value. The most comprehensive document on the current science of imperial Rome, it is at the same time an index to the attainments of previous epochs in man's pursuit after knowledge....

The account of Quintilian is very lucid. Especially sound is the criticism of Book X, namely that the chapter on literature is far from being a piece of pure literary criticism (400). Valuable also is the tracing of Quintilian's influence as an educator through the ages (411-413).

¹The first edition appeared in 1910.

This chapter also takes up Frontinus (422-431), Valerius Flaccus (433-451), Silius Italicus (452-466), Statius (467-497), and Martial (498-530). Excellent is the comparison between Valerius Flaccus and Apollonius; the very plausible suggestion of Summers (repeated by Butler, 182) that Valerius intended to bring the Argonauts into relation with places in Italy, is accepted (447).

Both Martial and Statius are treated in copious detail. The latter is characterized as a social aesthete (471), a description which, in my opinion, does not do him justice, and the whole account leaves one cold. This is not the case with the treatment of Martial, who is pointedly characterized as one who "...could only be himself" (521). Excellent translations of individual epigrams which are interwoven in the narrative add an unusual freshness to the discussion.

The period of Nerva and of Trajan includes three great names, Pliny the Younger (531-558), Tacitus (558-598), and Juvenal (599-627). All three are very satisfactorily treated. The discussion of letter-writing as a Roman product is good, as is the comparison of the letters of Cicero, Seneca, and Pliny (541-543). With their essay-like touches Pliny's Letters have the effect of "...a miscellany of miniature studies or feuilletons ..." (543). Pliny "...was not a mere scholastic rhetorician..." (553). Professor Duff accepts Gude-man's date for Tacitus, *Dialogus* (before the reign of Domitian) as the most satisfactory (565).

The chapter on the literature in the reign of Hadrian embraces only two writers, Suetonius and Florus. The treatment of these authors is preceded by a discussion of the poetic qualities of the Emperor himself, including a translation of the famous *Anima vagula, blandula*.

The book is a great accomplishment. Without entering into futile controversies, it embodies the soundest scholarly views, reinforced by many fine characterizations and inspiring observations and criticisms derived from a thorough study of the authors treated. The bibliographies appended, though they are far from being complete and up-to-date, nevertheless show judicious selection. It was not the author's intention to make these bibliographies complete (Preface, xi).

HUNTER COLLEGE,
NEW YORK CITY

JACOB HAMMER

The *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius, Book III.
Edited, with Introduction and Commentary, by
Marshall M. Gillies. Cambridge: At the University
Press (1928). Pp. xlviii + 160. \$5.00.

In his recent book, *Hellenistic Civilization* (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 22.53-56), Professor W. W. Tarn, the eminent English Hellenistic scholar, writes (Preface, v):

The neglect in Britain of this <= the Hellenistic> period, in spite of its varied interest, has been notorious, and there is no work in English to which any one who desires a connected view of the Greek world during these centuries can turn.

Again, in his Bibliography (302), he says: "There is no history in English of later Greek literature". Professor Tarn's book temporarily supplies this long-felt need. There is a corresponding lack of English editions of Alexandrian authors. I therefore welcome Mr. Gillies's edition of the third book of the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius. The purpose of the edition is stated thus by the editor (xlv):

...modern critics have set the fashion of disparaging this poet <= Apollonius>, and of admitting his merits only in so far as they can be shown to be inferior to those of Homer or Vergil. It is the purpose of this edition of the third book to make the best part of the *Argonautica* more accessible to the student of the classics, to put the evidence before him from a less conventional point of view, and to stimulate him to form his own judgment of a work which is unique of its kind, and which has long been in exile from its proper place among the masterpieces of ancient Greek literature.

In his Preface (v) Dr. Gillies apologizes for the length of his Introduction:

...the justification of its length is the absence of a suitable text-book in English of the literature of this period, to which summary reference might have been made....

It will be seen that he is in perfect agreement with what Professor Tarn has stated in the passages quoted above. Since the Introduction combines equally conciseness and scholarship, apology for it is not necessary; on the contrary, the attempt to supply the book with an outline of Alexandrian poetry is in itself laudable, especially since the function of the book (v) is ...to present the *Argonautica* to the student as something more than a mere happy hunting-ground, where the adventurous examiner tracks down and captures tantalizing extracts for Unseen Translation.

Since I do not believe in reading the *Argonautica* in selections, I am glad that Dr. Gillies decided upon an edition of the entire third book. Upon the execution of this book the poet spared no pains; the book constitutes the climax of his poetic efforts. In this book Apollonius placed the love-motif in the foreground and assigned to it a place which neither the earlier epic nor tragedy (down to the time of Euripides) ever gave to that motif. In the *Odyssey* Nausicaa's budding love for Odysseus is but a small episode. In tragedy the love-motif became the basic principle of action only with Euripides, who introduced it into some of his tragedies. The New Comedy took over this motif from Euripides; in almost all such comedies love is the *spiritus movens* of the action. In Roman comedy, with the exception of the *Captivi* of Plautus, it plays a similar part. To our knowledge, however, Apollonius is the first epic poet to introduce love as the basic element of action in a heroic epic¹, for every task performed by Jason in the country of the Colchians is accomplished *Μηδείης ὑπὲρ ἔρωτος* (3.3). Apollonius's version of Medea's passion for Jason was also a model for the story of the love of Dido and Aeneas in the fourth book of the *Aeneid*, although Dido, to be sure,

¹See Alfred Körte, *Hellenistische Dichtung*, 167 (A. Kröner, Leipzig, 1925). <This work has been translated, by Jacob Hammer and Moses Hadas. The translation, under the title, *Hellenistic Poetry*, has been published by the Columbia University Press (1929). C. K.>.

is a finer romantic creation than Medea. The latter, however, in the third book of the *Argonautica* is not the sorceress Medea who is painted in the grim colors so familiar to every reader of Euripides's *Medea*, but a loving, innocent maiden who readily sacrificed everything on the altar of love, love that finally proved her doom. From every point of view, then, this book deserves to be read by the student of Greek and Latin. The student of Greek will see that, although Apollonius cannot compare with Homer, he cannot be considered simply his imitator. The student of Latin will find that Apollonius's influence was not confined to Vergil; Catullus was indebted to him, Propertius studied him, Ovid drew upon him for *Heroides* 12. Also, through a translation into Latin, made by Varro Atacinus in the age of Caesar, and through a free Latin version, made by Valerius Flaccus in the time of Vespasian, which is still extant, Apollonius enjoyed a considerable vogue at Rome.

Mr. Gillies's Introduction, as is suggested above, is excellently written and prepares the student well for the study of Apollonius. It is divided into three parts. After a short sketch of the importance of the poet (ix-x), we have I. A Short Survey of Alexandrian Literature (x-xxviii), which treats all the *genera* of literature that flourished in the metropolis on the Nile. Part II (xxix-xlv) is devoted to the *Argonautica*. It gives an outline of the poem; much space is also devoted to a criticism of the good and the bad features of the poem and of the learned pedantries of the poet. The difference between the handling of the love-motif in *The New Comedy* and the treatment of it in the third book of the *Argonautica* are excellently presented (xlii):

...Apollonius has rejected the conventions of an earlier age, and has developed his theme in its simplest and noblest form.... He has dispensed with the attendant of the *New Comedy*, whose furtive services were essential to the consummation of even the most romantic union. He has risen above the atmosphere of secrecy and guilty repression in which the old bawd of the mime performed her similar functions....

This extinction of the go-between was a simple, but a great, achievement....

I should like to see mention of the fact that Apollonius was the first Greek poet who himself divided his poem into books.

Apollonius's relations with Callimachus are considered. Dr. Gillies is inclined to think (xlv) that Callimachus's opposition to the *Argonautica* was perhaps caused "...only technically by the crude immaturity of a youthful experiment in the forbidden department of epic composition, and actually by the adaptation of epic to romance..." I may quote in this connection the opinion of Professor Körte (151), which I give in translation:

We now know that Apollonius was the successor of Zenodotus in the administration of the Alexandrian Library, and that he was the tutor of Ptolemy Euergetes. He would therefore not be much younger than Callimachus—perhaps ten years. Time and again he is called the pupil of Callimachus.... The peculiar point is that the disciple or younger contemporary was librarian at the time when Callimachus was compiling his great catalogue, that is to say, that while he was

not his master's superior officer he yet occupied a higher rank. This fact may have been the source of their mutual discords.

The Bibliography (xlvi-xlviii) is selective, not exhaustive. I should like to see included among the books the excellent little volume by Körte (see above, footnote 1).

The commentary is well adapted to the student's needs. Assistance is given to him in translation and on the linguistic and grammatical peculiarities of Apollonius. Stress is laid on the relation of Apollonius's language to that of Homer; the parallel passages cited include not only passages from Homer and other classical authors, Greek and Latin, but also passages from other Alexandrian poets. Attention is called to departures from Homeric ideas (page 32) and to passages in Apollonius which show a symmetrical structure (page 67). In short, if one compares this commentary (134 pages) with the 78 pages which Professor G. W. Mooney (*The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1912) gives to the third book, he will see the wealth of material added in Mr. Gillies's notes (although Dr. Gillies modestly disclaims competition with Mr. Mooney's edition²).

It is to be hoped that Mr. Gillies's book will revive interest not only in Apollonius but in Alexandrian literature in general.

HUNTER COLLEGE
NEW YORK CITY

JACOB HAMMER

Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Lateinischen Sprache, Hauptsächlich bestimmt für Höhere Schulen und für Klassische Philologen. Von August Zimmermann. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung (1915)¹. Pp. VIII + 292.

Kurze Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, vom Sprachvergleichenden Standpunkt aus Hauptsächlich für Kollegen und Studenten der Klassischen Philologie. Von August Zimmermann. München: Kommissionsverlag R. Oldenbourg (1925). Pp. 228.

Dr. Zimmermann is distressed at having to change his doctrine with every advance (or rather change) of science, and thinks it wrong to confront a classical scholar with Sanskrit and other unknown languages. He will therefore supply books which can be understood, and which shall avoid the rash ventures of Alois Walde's *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (second edition, Heidelberg, Winter, 1910), and of Ferdinand Sommer's *Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (second and third edition, Heidelberg, Winter, 1914).

The first purpose is accomplished well enough, although numerous misprints, particularly in Greek words, obscure the meaning of the grammar. The dictionary is better printed.

¹For a review of this edition, by Professor D. M. Robinson, see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.172, 173-176. Professor Robinson does not esteem Mr. Mooney's book as highly as Mr. Gillies does. C. K.>.

²In spite of the date of this book, a notice of it here is well worth while. The books dealing with the etymologies of Latin words are so pitifully few that the student ought to be warned if any one of them is, in the opinion of a competent scholar, a trap for the unwary. C. K.>.

In spite of much inconclusive polemic against Walde and Sommer, a considerable part of the treatment is really theirs. When Dr. Zimmermann strikes out for himself, the result is not the conservative treatment we were looking for, but things that will be new to almost any reader.

We are advised (Formenlehre, 61-62) to begin our study of Latin morphology by investigating the speech of modern babes. These frequently say *ma*, *am*, *mam*, *am(m)a*, *mam(m)a*, sounds which are induced by the movements of sucking. By these words the child means first 'something to suck or drink', then 'mother's breast', and, finally, 'mother'. Since hunger leads the child to say *ma* in a woebegone tone, our author suggests

this as the origin of the Greek prohibitive particle $\mu\eta$. He sees *am*, 'mother's breast', and then 'roundness', in Latin *am*-, 'around' <in *am-icio*, 'I throw around'>; compare *circum* from *circus*, ring. *Amare*, he thinks, may also come from *am* and may be translated by 'surround', or, it may come from *ama*, 'dear (mother)', and may mean 'to mother', 'to love'. A by-form *mam*, 'around', is said to yield a noun-stem *mam*, 'hand', whence *mando*, *manceps*, etc. In *amica* Dr. Zimmermann finds *am* with 'the caressing suffix *i*' and *ca*, which here functions as an article.

A man who can write such nonsense need not be taken seriously.

YALE UNIVERSITY

EDGAR H. STURTEVANT